DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 414 373 UD 032 032

AUTHOR	Gottlieb, Jay; Alter, Mark
TITLE	An Evaluation Study of the Impact of Modifying Instructional Group Sizes in Resource Rooms and Related Service Groups in New York City. Final Report. Revised.
INSTITUTION	New York Univ., NY. School of Education.
SPONS AGENCY	New York State Education Dept., Albany. Office for Special Education Services.
PUB DATE	1997-07-10
NOTE	84p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; *Class Size; Cost Effectiveness; Educational Finance; Elementary Secondary Education; *Group Instruction; Mainstreaming; Mathematics Achievement; Reading Achievement; Referral; *Resource Room Programs; *Special Education; *Speech Instruction; *Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS	*New York City Board of Education

ABSTRACT

New York University studied the impact of increases in instructional group size in resource rooms and speech service in the New York City Public Schools by examining increases in 45 public elementary, middle, and senior high schools. Questionnaires were distributed to parents, and teachers and administrators were interviewed. Observations of resource rooms and analysis of achievement data in reading and arithmetic for general education and resource room students also provided study data. About $26 million was saved from the resource room program, an amount that agreed with projected savings. There was a substantial decrease in the reading achievement scores of resource room students, especially at the sixth grade level. Mathematics scores also declined, but not significantly. Resource room teachers reported that the increase in instructional group size diminished their ability to help students. Direct observations of resource room instruction revealed that very little time was spent on individual instruction. Most resource room students received group instruction. Students, on the whole, did tend to be on task in resource room instruction. Observation also indicated that about one-fourth of instructional time was spent escorting students to and from their classrooms, further decreasing instructional time. As students moved through the grades, they were progressively less likely to attend the resource rooms. Parents, who generally thought that the resource room helped their children, were not usually aware of the instructional group size. Waiting lists for students requiring speech services were reduced substantially, but data were insufficient to determine the impact of changed group size on speech service. These findings led to the recommendation that no more than five students should receive resource room instruction at one time. Eleven appendixes contain questionnaires and study correspondence. (Contains five tables.) (SLD)

ED 414 373

New York University
School of Education
Department of Teaching and Learning

FINAL REPORT

An Evaluation Study of the Impact of Modifying Instructional Group Sizes in Resource Rooms and Related Service Groups in New York City

Revised July 10, 1997

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mark Alter

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Conducted for:
the New York State Education Department
Office of Vocational and Educational Services
for Individuals with Disabilities
Office for Special Education Services

Principal Investigators:
Jay Gottlieb, Ph.D.
Mark Alter, Ph.D.
Department of Teaching and Learning
School of Education
New York University
239 Greene Street
New York, NY 10003

UD032 032

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	pp.	2-3
Evaluation Narrative	p.	4
Background	p.	4
Purpose of the Study-Evaluation Objectives	p.	5
Overview of Proposed Methods	p.	7
Plan of Operation	p.	7
Results by Evaluation Objective	p.	8-32
Summary of Findings, Conclusions, Limitations	p.	33
Recommendation	p.	36
List of Tables and Appendices	p.	37
Listing of Statistical Tables 1 - 5	p.	38 - 45
Questionnaires & Chronology of Correspondence	Appendices A - K	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

New York University responded to the RFP issued by the New York State Education Department to study the impact of increases in instructional group size in resource rooms and speech service in the New York City Public Schools. We conducted the evaluation in 45 public elementary, middle, and senior high schools. We distributed questionnaires to parents, interviewed teachers and administrators, observed resource rooms, and analyzed standardized reading and arithmetic achievement data for general education and resource room students.

Our salient findings included the following:

1. About $26 million dollars were saved from the resource room program. This amount concurred with the projected savings.
2. There was a substantial decrease in the reading achievement scores of resource room students, especially at the sixth grade level. Math scores also declined, but not significantly.
3. Resource room teachers reported that the increase in instructional group size diminished their ability to help students.
4. Direct observations of resource room instruction revealed that very little time was spent on individual instruction. Most resource room students received group instruction. Students, on the whole, tended to be on-task during resource room instruction.
5. Based on direct observations, about one-fourth of the allotted instructional time involved escorting students to and from their classrooms, thereby decreasing

available instructional time.

6. As students progressed annually from primary school to middle school to high school, they were progressively less likely to attend resource room when in school.

7. The increase in instructional group size did not result in a corresponding increase in the number of children placed in more restrictive settings.

8. The substantial majority of parents found that resource room helped their children, although most parents were not well informed of resource room practices. Generally parents were not aware of the instructional group size of their child's resource room.

9. Waiting lists for students with disabilities requiring speech service were reduced substantially, although many students continue to remain on the current waiting lists. Due to a lack of data, however, we were unable to determine the impact of changed group size on speech service.

Based on these findings, we advance one recommendation:

Because the increase in resource room group size adversely impacted students' academic performance, in terms of test scores and amount of instructional time received, we recommend that no more than five students receive resource room instruction at any one time.

The data we collected for speech service were not as conclusive as they were for resource room programming, and therefore we do not offer recommendations in this area.

EVALUATION NARRATIVE

New York University is providing a final report for the evaluation study of the impact of mandate relief that increased instructional group size in resource room and speech service. The overall framework of this report is as follows. In the first section, we review the purposes of the report, the methodology, including deviations between the proposed methods and the actual methods. These deviations are confined to changes in the number of schools that actually participated in the evaluation, not to changes in the nature of evaluation activities.

The second section of the report details findings for each of the ten evaluation objectives. The third and final section synthesizes the data with our recommendations regarding resource room and speech programming.

Background

Prior to July 1, 1995, Regulation 8NYCRR00.6(f) required that the student to staff ratio in resource rooms and related service instructional groups could not exceed five students to one teacher. Due to overcrowded schools and fiscal constraints, the New York City School District requested that the State Education Department allow a variance to increase the student to teacher ratio in these settings. Section 4403 of the Education Law as amended by Chapter 82 of the Laws of 1995 authorized the New York City School district to increase the number of students in a resource room program and a related service group as follows:

> The New York City School District is allowed a variance of up to 50% rounded up to the nearest whole number from

> the maximum number of students as specified in regulation in an instructional group in a resource room program, a related service group, and the total number of students assigned to a resource room teacher.

Pursuant to this provision of the law, many school districts of the City of New York increased the student/teacher ratio for instructional group sizes of resource rooms and related service groups from five to at most eight students to one teacher.

In May of 1996, The State Education Department, Office of Vocational and Educational Services for Individuals with Disabilities, requested proposals for a study that would evaluate the impact of increased instructional group size in resource rooms and related service groups in the New York City School District. While both federal and state statutes guarantee a free and appropriate education to children with disabilities, and although related services and resource rooms are two of the least restrictive settings, they are deemed necessary, by a team of trained evaluators, for the appropriate education of the children they service. Therefore, the State Education Department asked that the study evaluate the impact of increased group size on the quality and availability of resource room and related service instruction.

Purposes of the Study-Evaluation Objectives

The State Education Department requested that the study address the following issues

1. To what extent did the instructional group sizes in resource rooms and related service groups in New York City increase as a result of the legislative and regulatory changes?

2. To what extent did the number of students receiving speech and language improvement services increase or decrease as a result of these amendments?

3. To what extent did the number of students with disabilities receiving resource room and related services increase or decrease as a result of these amendments?

4. What was the impact on the quality of instruction (including teachers', parents', and administrators' perspectives) provided to students in resource rooms and related service groups?

5. To what extent were the individualized education programs (IEPS) amended to reflect the larger instructional group sizes in related services and resource rooms?

6. What are the effects of student achievement which resulted from an increase in resource room and related services instructional group increases?

7. To what extent did decisions to increase instructional group sizes in resource rooms or related services instructional groups result in students placed in more restrictive placements?

8. What was the fiscal impact of these changes on the NYC Board of Education? Were the cost savings realized?

9. To what extent did these changes impact on New York City's ability to provide a timely, free and appropriate public education to students with disabilities?

10. To what extent did mediation and/or impartial hearings result from these changes?

Overview of Proposed Methods

In the evaluation proposal that was subsequently accepted, we proposed to identify a proportional random sample of 45 schools, 30 schools (70%) at the primary level, 9 schools (20%) at the middle/intermediate/junior high school level, and 6 high schools (10%) at the secondary level. Forty-five schools represent an approximate 5% distribution of the approximately 900 public schools in New York City, not including the variety of alternative schools, of which about 70% are at the elementary level, 20% at the middle school level, and the remaining 10% at the secondary level. The investigators identified 45 schools following the school level breakdowns indicated above.

Plan of Operation

The two Project Directors had overall responsibility for the implementation of the project. Mark Alter and Jay Gottlieb supervised all facets of the evaluation. Drs. Gottlieb and Alter shared responsibility for writing the final report.

We convened a Technical Advisory Group to review the project development, sampling, survey, and data analysis procedures for validity, reliability, and appropriateness. The following people served on the committee:

Dr. Barbara W. Gottlieb, Chair, Department of Specialized Services in Education, Lehman College of the City University of New York. Dr. Gottlieb is a licensed psychologist and an experienced, certified developmental reading teacher. She reviewed instruments for appropriateness.

Dr. Susan Polirstok, Professor of Special Education, Lehman College of the City University of New York. Dr. Polirstock is an expert in the field of applied behavior analysis and reviewed the validity and reliability of our observational procedures.

Dr. Rebecca Cort, regional coordinator for the New York State Education Department. Dr. Cort has a detailed knowledge of the special education division of the New York City schools.

Mr. Edward Sermier, formerly Executive Director of the Division of Special Education for the New York City Board of Education and currently the chief financial officer for the New York City Philharmonic Orchestra. Mr. Sermier advised us on issues related to special education administration, with particular focus on fiscal issues.

Working with the Technical Advisory Group and the principal investigators, three senior investigators, faculty at N.Y.U., supervised a team of twelve graduate students in special education and/or elementary education: each senior investigator supervised a team of four graduate students. Each team was responsible for fifteen schools, ten primary, three middle, and two high schools. One advanced graduate student, selected from among the twelve, served as a project coordinator, having additional responsibility for organizing and collating all incoming data. All twelve graduate students interviewed resource room teachers, general education classroom teachers, school-based support team members, related service providers and administrators in each school for which they were responsible.

The sequence of field-based activities for the evaluation was as follows:

1. The principal evaluators identified a random sample of 45 schools.

2. The principal investigators contacted Dr. Rizzo's office asking her to inform community superintendents about the evaluation and to make them aware of the school(s) in their districts selected to participate. We asked Dr. Rizzo's office to have the superintendents inform the principals of the schools selected.

3. The five senior investigators divided the list of 45 schools equally, with each taking responsibility to contact and interview nine building principals. Almost always, the principals asked the special education supervisor to attend the meeting.

4. At the conclusion of the principal interviews, the senior investigator handed the administrator a packet of parent questionnaires. The administrator was asked to distribute them to the resource room and speech teachers in the school and to have the teachers give one questionnaire to each child in their class for their parents to complete. Each parent questionnaire was accompanied by a stamped self-addressed envelope so the parent could return the form directly to the evaluators, bypassing the school professional.

Also, at the end of the principal interview, the senior investigator asked to schedule a time when a graduate research assistant could interview the resource room and speech teachers as well as a general education classroom teacher who taught a resource room student in his/her class.

5. The graduate research assistant contacted the teachers to arrange for the interview. At the conclusion of the interview, the graduate assistant scheduled a time to conduct observations in the resource room.

Concurrent with the interviews, the twelve graduate students, were trained to

conduct multiple reliable observations of students' academic behavior in 24 schools. The observations focused on special education students' time on-task. All senior staff conducted this training in consultation with the technical advisory committee.

Parallel with the implementation of the field activities, a set of university-based activities was being carried out. These activities included:

1. The graduate student who served as research coordinator obtained the 1994, 1995, and 1996 test scores on the Degrees of Reading Power (DRP) test and the corresponding math standardized test scores of all resource room students and students who received related services within the 39 elementary and middle schools sampled. These data were not available for high school students.

2. The principal evaluators contacted the Office of Accountability and Assessment, The Office of Student Information Services, and the Budget Office to obtain relevant information from the Board of Education's computerized data files.

Although we conducted the evaluation precisely in accord with the methods we proposed, fewer schools participated in the evaluation than projected. This discrepancy was due to several factors.

When we received written notification that S.E.D. informed the Chancellor's office of the evaluation award to N.Y.U., we drafted a letter for the Deputy Chancellor's office that we intended as information for the community superintendents. In drafting the letter our purpose was to provide the Deputy Chancellor' office with information pertinent to the evaluation, and how the districts would be affected. The Deputy Chancellor's office, in turn, would use our letter as the basis for its own letter

to the superintendents. We faxed the letter in late August fully expecting the community superintendents to be informed of the evaluation by mid to late September. When, in late September, we called to find out whether the letters had been disseminated, we were informed that it had not been written and that the fax was misplaced. As a result, we experienced a month's delay in beginning the evaluation study, and in some districts, our personnel contacted schools before the district superintendent was informed by the Deputy Chancellor's office or before the community superintendent informed the principals. Many principals were thus fearful of participating in the evaluation. Our original plan of conducting all evaluation activities between October and December was thus rendered impossible.

Once principals were interviewed, we had to schedule interviews with resource room teachers, speech teachers and classroom teachers. Some teachers refused to be interviewed, and of those that consented to the interview, many refused to be observed. The letter from the Deputy Chancellor to the community superintendents made it clear that participation in the evaluation was voluntary, and by the time we realized that we would not be able to convince reluctant schools to participate, time was passing rapidly, and we had little leverage to reverse the situation. With these factors in mind, we suspect that the interview and observational data reported represent a best case scenario insofar as they were collected in schools where administrators and teachers felt sufficiently secure to allow the evaluation to proceed.

RESULTS BY EVALUATION OBJECTIVE

This section is organized to report findings for each evaluation objective in the order that they appeared in the RFP. Following this, we present a concise summary of the most important findings, the limitations of the results both with respect to the availability of data appropriate to address the question, and with regard to other, unanswered questions that should be considered when deciding policy. We conclude with a set of recommendations.

Analysis of Evaluation Objectives

Evaluation Objective 1. To what extent did the instructional group sizes in resource rooms and related service groups in New York City increase as a result of the legislative and regulatory changes?

Interviews in 25 schools indicated that all but one increased instructional group size in both resource room and speech programs. Indeed, in a memorandum to the field dated May 1995, from Howard Tames, the former executive director special education, community school district professional staff members were informed that all schools were to increase instructional group size. Our data indicate that almost all schools did.

Evaluation Objective 2. To what extent did the number of students receiving speech and language improvement services increase or decrease as a result of these amendments?

The Board of Education compiles data separately for students with disabilities who require speech as a related service depending upon whether students are monolingual or bilingual. In addition, the Board keeps records of students who actually receive speech services and those who are awaiting receipt of such service. Finally, separate tallies are recorded as they relate to the locus of speech delivery, that is, for students who receive their speech service from Board of Education personnel, agency providers, or independent contractors. In our review of these data, we separate each locus of speech services delineated above. These data appear in Table 1 located in the appendix beginning of page 37.

During the 1994-95 school year prior to mandate relief, overall, 23,644 students in community school districts received speech services and 15,124 were awaiting service. In other words, 61% of students who required speech were actually receiving that service. In the following, 1995-96 school year, 30,034 students received speech services and 12,197 were awaiting service. Thus, immediately following mandate relief, 71.1% of students who required speech received it.

Table 1 (p. 38) presents totals for children receiving and awaiting speech service separately by provider, monolingual versus bilingual service, and school year. It should be borne in mind that the primary goal for the Board of Education vis-a-vis speech service was the desire to reduce waiting lists. We are not aware, however, whether specific target reductions were established as goals for mandate relief.

The data in the table also indicate that Board of Education speech providers increased their share of the overall number of students, both monolingual and bilingual,

who received speech, from 22,913 during the 1994-95 school year to 29,173 the following year, an increase of 6,260 students.

It is instructive to note that in 1995-96, 6,390 more students received speech than during the previous year. Thus, although mandate relief allowed the Board of Education to provide for almost the entire increase in number of children who received speech, it did not result in a decrease in the actual number number of students seen by outside providers. Indeed, in the year following mandate relief, the number of students receiving speech from outside providers increased from 731 to 1,004, a net increase of 273 students.

The data in Table 1 also indicate that many children still are waiting to receive mandated speech services, and that this waiting list is not equally distributed across language needs. A majority of bilingual children still await speech services. As is evident from Table 1, the bulk of the decrease of students on waiting lists occurred for students in need of monolingual speech. The waiting list for this population decreased from 11,141 to 8,724, a reduction of 21.7%. The waiting list for students in need of bilingual speech services decreased from 3,983 to 3,473, a reduction of only 12.8%.

Evaluation Objective 3. To what extent did the number of students with disabilities receiving resource room and related services increase or decrease as a result of these amendments?

According to data provided by the budget office, 30,202 elementary and middle school students were registered to receive resource room service during the 1994-1995

school year; the corresponding figure for the following school year, 1995-96, immediately after mandate relief went into effect, was 32,111 students. This represents an increase of 1909 students, or 6.3%.

The increase in the student population was accompanied by a decrease of 491 teachers, from 1,724 in 1994-95 to 1,233 the following year. When we disaggregate these numbers by level of schooling, the following data emerge:

	Primary		Middle		Totals	
	Students	Teachers	Students	Teachers	Students	Teachers
1994-95	18,612	1,145	11,590	579	30,202	1,724
1995-96	20,418	837	11,963	396	32,381	1,233

Averaging the above data separately for elementary and middle schools, we get the following student to teacher ratios:

	Student/Teacher Ratio (Elementary)	Student/Teacher Ratio (Middle School)
1994-95	16.26:1	20.02:1
1995-96	24.39:1	30.21:1

These data indicate that the effect of mandate relief, as intended, was to increase the student to teacher ratio by about 50%.

While we were able to obtain precise data for elementary and middle school

teachers and students, we were not provided equally accurate data for high schools. Computer printouts from different sources provide slightly different data. Our best estimate is that between 1994-95 and 1995-96 there was a decrease in the number of students attending resource room programs, from 12,496 to 11,908, or 588 students. There was a comparable reduction in teachers from 967 to 795, or 172 teachers.

Evaluation Objective 4. What was the impact on the quality of instruction (including teachers', parents', and administrators' perspectives) provided to students in resource rooms and related service groups?

We evaluated this objective from several perspectives. We distributed about 1,600 questionnaires for parents to complete, and we received 168 (10.5%) responses. We interviewed principals and special education site supervisors in 25 schools. Also, from among the 25 schools where we interviewed administrators we interviewed 23 resource room teachers, 20 speech therapists, and 18 general education teachers who had resource room students enrolled in their classes.

Parent Questionnaires

We distributed 20 to 60 questionnaires in each school, depending on the number of resource rooms in the building. We handed the questionnaires to site supervisors or principals and instructed them to give them to the resource room teachers, who in turn would hand them out to students in their classes. Questionnaires were written in both English and Spanish and parents could complete the form in their preferred language. Some teachers refused to distribute them to their students.

Parents' responses indicated one overriding fact: that resource room support helped their children academically. Seventy-two percent of the respondents indicated that resource room helped their children academically, 10% stated that it had not helped, and 18% did not know one way or the other. On the other hand, the vast majority of parents did not know many of the basic facts of resource room programming. A high proportion, 44%, did not know whether the number of students in their child's resource room had changed during the previous year. Another 18.5% stated that it had not changed, when it had. Only 37.5% indicated that there was an increase in students assigned to their child's resource room.

As part of the questionnaire we asked parents to offer open-ended comments. Sixty parents commented. The largest block of responses, 25, indicated that parents were very pleased with the resource room service or the resource room teacher. The second largest block of responses, nine, dealt with parents fears and concerns about increasing the number of students in resource room. The remaining comments dealt with a variety of issues, none standing out to any appreciable degree.

Principal and Site Supervisor Interviews

Our original intent was to interview building principals alone. However, very few building principals felt sufficiently knowledgeable about special education to sit for the interview without being accompanied by the special education site supervisor. Some principals refused to be interviewed but volunteered their special education supervisors in their place. We did not conduct interviews in these schools.

We interviewed 25 principals. The overriding outcome of these interviews was,

not surprisingly, that the principals did not think increases in instructional group size was a good idea. One building principal put it bluntly: "You don't have to be a rocket scientist to know this was a bad idea."

Two consistent pieces of more specific information emerged from our interviews of building administrators. First, although principals and special education supervisors were uniformly opposed to the increase in resource room and speech instructional group size, they had no "hard" data to prove that it adversely affected children. The only objective data that they presented was that in two schools (of the 25), resource room teachers put in requests for reevaluations because they believed the resource room was no longer an appropriate placement for some students.

The second consistent finding to emerge from the interviews was that building principals had almost no role in configuring the newly-sized resource room. Indeed, the primary reason, and perhaps the only reason, principals got involved in this process was when the increased instructional group size required a larger space for the resource room. Space in New York City schools is at a premium, and resource rooms, because they serve fewer students, are often given whatever space is available that cannot be used for classrooms. When the increase in instructional group size necessitated a change in the room assignment of the resource room, the principal invariably was involved.

Schools were, of necessity, extremely flexible in the assignment of space for resource room instruction. In several schools, resource rooms share a space with other programs, either another resource room or a speech teacher, with the two programs

occurring simultaneously. In one school, all four resource rooms occupied one large classroom separated by dividers. In other schools, closets, storage rooms or other available space was used for the resource room. Four teachers whom we interviewed stated that the increase in group size necessitated movement to less desirable (more crowded) space.

Resource Room Teacher Interviews

Twenty-three resource room teachers, representing all levels of schooling, were interviewed. These teachers indicated that the increase in instructional group size made it more difficult for them to deliver effective instruction for their students. Nineteen of the 23 teachers stated that the increase allowed them less time to remediate children's educational deficits, that they could not plan consistent educational plans, and that it was difficult to offer individual instruction. Three teachers focused on the behavioral problems that resulted and how it was more difficult to manage the group. The final teacher was more broad-based in her evaluation. She stated that it was an overall "disaster."

Despite the uniformly poor reviews for the increases in instructional group size, teachers still maintained they were able to accommodate students' needs, although less effectively and with greater difficulty than before. Only two of the 23 teachers we interviewed believed that the larger group size rendered the resource room largely ineffective.

Speech Teacher Interviews

Several consistent patterns emerged from interviews of speech teachers. The

majority of speech personnel indicated that the increase in case load did not overly affect their ability to deliver service. But these teachers were quick to say that even before the increase in instructional group size, children were grouped more to accommodate scheduling considerations than to adapt to their language needs. Indeed, the major drawback of the increase in caseload, as the speech teachers expressed it, was the reduction in the number of children they were able to see individually. Sixteen of the twenty teachers we interviewed indicated that they saw fewer children for individual speech correction than they had before the change.

Another consistent finding was the isolation, or separation, of speech service from general education and from other special education programs. Whereas fourteen of the twenty speech therapists ranked as their primary role the delivery of language intervention services, few thought it was especially important to meet with teachers, and in fact, not many had regularly scheduled meeting with general education teachers. Only two of the twenty speech therapists indicated they met often with classroom teachers, while nine said they never met. The remaining teachers met "sometimes."

We were not able to obtain any "hard" data on the effectiveness of speech service. Although, as we showed above, there was an increase in the number of students who received speech, we do not know the extent to which the increase resulted in fewer positive outcomes for individual children's speech and/or language disabilities that were responsible for their being offered speech services in the first place. Our analysis of resource room programming, on the other hand, did not share this limitation.

Analysis of 31 hours of Observations in the Resource Room

Twelve graduate students were trained in observational methods. We employed a 10-second momentary time-sampling approach. Because of time constraints we confined our observations to issues related to on-task or off-task behavior of students. We were able to attain an interrater reliability of 80% agreement when we kept the observation schedules simple, which we did. We also collected a variety of management data, such as: when the classes were scheduled to begin and end, and when they did actually begin, and the number of children on register and the number who attended during the observations.

We observed resource rooms in 20 school buildings on 43 separate occasions for a total of 1861 minutes, or slightly more than 31 hours. Of the 43 observations, 27 were conducted in primary schools, nine in middle schools and seven in high schools.

An average of 7.02 students were on register, and an average of 5.23 attended during our 43 observation sessions. Resource rooms were observed between one and three times, depending upon scheduling considerations. All observations were conducted with the full knowledge and cooperation of the resource room teacher as well as with parent consent. Indeed, the schedule for observations was made at a time convenient for both the teacher and the observer.

Time Available for Instruction

On average, resource room periods in the schools where we observed were scheduled for 45 minutes. An average of nine of the 45 minutes allotted for instruction in resource rooms (20%) was spent shepherding children to and from their classrooms.

In sum, across all levels of schooling, only 80% of the allotted time was actually available for instruction.

The data available for instruction may be presented somewhat differently. In groups where five or fewer students were on register, 16.6% (1/6) of the instructional sessions were delayed more than 10 minutes. In groups where more than five students were on register, 37.8% (14/37) of the sessions were delayed more than 10 minutes.

The observation data above mask the fact that at the elementary schools, teachers or paraprofessionals are responsible for taking resource room children to and from their classrooms, while at the middle and secondary schools, students come and go on their own. Consequently, we would expect differences in time available for instruction to reflect these different policies. The observational data below are presented separately for primary and secondary (middle + high schools) levels.

At the elementary school level where teachers (or a para) are responsible for picking up and returning students to their classrooms, on average, more than 11 minutes of the 45 minute period are used for escorting children. More precisely, only 34.18 of the 45.33 minutes (75.4%) of allotted time in resource rooms is available for instructional purposes.

At the middle school, actual instructional time was delayed by only 4.2 minutes of the scheduled 44.8 minutes (8.75%). This may be attributable in part to the smaller class registers at the middle school level than at the elementary schools.

No delays in instructional time were observed at the high schools.

Attendance

At the elementary level, an average of 6.8 students were on register and an average of 5.9 students (86.8%) attended during our 27 observations. The percentage of students who attend resource room programming compares favorably with the approximately 90% average daily attendance at the elementary school level.

In the middle schools, an average of 6.3 students were on register and an average of 4.1 attended (65%). The percentage of children who attend resource room is below that of the 87% average daily attendance for middle schools.

During the seven observations we made at three high schools, an average of 8.6 students were on register and an average of 4.1 attended (48%). This percentage compares unfavorably with the average high school attendance which is in the low 80% range, depending upon the specific method used to calculate attendance at the high school.

Instructional Grouping

Observations in the resource room confirmed teachers' responses during the interviews regarding lack of time for one-on-one instruction. Our observations, aggregated across all school levels, showed that whole-group instruction occurred 60.6% of the time whereas one-to-one instruction occurred only 3.4% of the time. The bulk of the remaining time is spent with the student doing individual assignments without active, direct instruction by the teacher. We do not have corresponding data from the prior year to compare changes that might have occurred consequently of changes in instructional group size.

On-Task Behavior

We indicated that 60.6% of the time in resource room was spent in whole-group lessons. During these lessons, students were on-task, defined as participating appropriately in the lesson, 78% of the time. By contrast, when individual instruction occurred, students were on-task 90% of the time. Overall, students were on-task during resource room activities.

Some differences in the percentage of on-task behavior were noted at the different school levels. At the elementary school level, despite the type of group the student was in, he or she was on task 80.2% of the time. At the middle school, students were on-task 75.1% of the time. The corresponding percentage at the high school was 80.6%.

The observation data reveal several important findings. First, they validate teachers' statements during the interviews that they are not able to engage in one-to-one instruction. The data also suggest that students' are participating appropriately in the academic lessons and that, at the elementary level, attendance is strong.

Evaluation Objective #5. To what extent were the individualized education programs (IEPS) amended to reflect the larger instructional group sizes in related services and resource rooms?

During the interviews we asked teachers whether the IEP's had been amended to reflect the change in instructional group size, when the change was made, and whether they had the IEP's available to demonstrate the change. Nearly all teachers

who interviewed, and who had been teaching in the same school the year prior to the interview, indicated the IEP's were amended during the annual review that occurred during the fall of 1995-96, after the change was put in place. We spot-checked IEP's in some of the classes where we interviewed teachers. The IEP's were, in fact, amended, as the teachers had indicated.

Evaluation Objective 6. What are the effects of student achievement which resulted from an increase in resource room and related services instructional group increases?

The intent of this objective was to analyze the impact of increases in instructional group size on both students resource room support and students who receive speech services. The central Board of Education office responsible for data collection and analysis does not routinely separate out as a distinct category children who receive speech for purposes of studying academic achievement scores. As a result, we have academic achievement data for students in resource room programs, but we do not have corresponding data for students who receive speech service.

We did not receive information on individual students, though this would have been preferred. Instead, the data we were given was the percentage of students in each school that passed the State Reference Point. We asked for, and received, separate breakouts for general education students and resource room students. Stated somewhat differently, the school and not the individual student, is the unit of analysis. Also, the Board does not routinely collect reading data from high school students.

Effects on Students in Resource Rooms

Interviews with resource room teachers uniformly indicated that they view their mission as providing remediation for academic subjects, primarily in reading and math. Consequently, we conducted analyses of reading and math scores. Data were provided by the Board of Education for 35 elementary and middle schools, of the 39 that were involved in the evaluation study. We received data for the remaining four schools late in the project, but the data sent were on a different sample of children within the schools, so we did not include the last four schools in our analyses.

The strategy of our analyses was twofold. First, we wished to compare standardized test scores for resource room students (no separate breakdown was available for children who receive speech services) both before and after the increase in instructional group size. We report on three years of tests scores for resource room students: the 1993-1994 school year that was one full year before mandate relief; the 1994-1995 school year that was immediately prior to mandate relief, and; the 1995-1996 school year immediately following implementation of mandate relief.

As an additional comparison, we compared the test scores of general education students during the same three-year period. We did so because it is possible that changes in test scores during a particular year could have been attributable to idiosyncrasies of the test and not to mandate relief. If so, general education students should be expected to demonstrate the same general pattern of test score changes as resource room students. If the patterns of test score performance differ by group we can more readably attribute the change to factors other than the test itself.

Statistically, we were looking for the presence of a significant interaction between Year of Test and Group (general education or resource room students). The means and standard deviations for the test data are presented in Table 3 (p. 40). The data in the table reflect means and (std. deviations) for percentage of students attaining the state reference point in reading at the school building level.

Our data on the achievement of resource room students are aggregate scores at the building level and were available for 866 students during the 1994-95 school year and 960 students during the 1995-96 school year, an 11% increase. The metric we employed, percentage of children exceeding the State Reference Point in reading, was selected because most resource room teachers said that they spend more time instructing in reading than in any other academic subject area.

Inspection of the data in Table 2 (p. 39) in the appendix reveals one very consistent finding: after increasing instructional group size, a substantial decline in the percentage of resource room students passing the state reference point at each grade level. An especially sharp decline occurred at the sixth grade (F for the Status (general education, resource room students) X Year interaction = 3.79, DF = 2/58, p = .028). The corresponding F value for the eighth grade was not significant but was clearly in the same general direction (F = 2.10, DF = 1/49, p = .15). Third grade children also declined but not more than children in general education. The F value for this interaction effect was not significant.

We elected to employ SRP scores rather than grade level scores. Very few resource room students read at grade level and the distributions for this variable would

be highly skewed. For example, only 6.74% (6.03%) of resource room students in 1996 read at grade level. This percentage was down slightly from the 1995 scores when 9.17 (9.19) percent of the resource room students read at grade level. SRP scores are a more sensitive measure than grade level scores of the academic performance of resource room students.

We also analyzed arithmetic scores, again using the state reference point minimum cutoffs as the criterion. As with reading, our approach was to compare the changes in scores of resource room students before the change in instructional group size was completed with scores after implementation. As an additional comparison we contrasted scores of resource room students with general education students attending the same schools but not receiving resource room support. Tables 3 and 4 in the appendix illustrate the relevant data, and presents the mean (std. deviation) percentage of students passing the minimum reference point for math.

Inspection of the data in Table 3 (in appendix) reveals that from 1994 to 1995, before mandate relief was implemented both general education and resource room students improved their math performance about four points, on average, with respect to percentages meeting state reference points. After implementation of mandate relief, general education students continued to improve whereas resource room students showed a four-point decline. The post mandate relief scores, however, did not differ from those two years earlier. Analysis of variance for the above data indicated no statistically significant interaction effects, implying that the change reported by resource room students did not differ significantly from that for students in general

education. Table 4 presents the math data separately for grades three and six, with similar results to the aggregate finding appearing in Table 3.

The sum total of the achievement data indicates clearly the negative impact that resulted from the increase in instructional group size in resource rooms, especially for reading at the sixth grade level. As such, the data add to our understanding of the circumstances concerning the effectiveness of resource room programming. A major purpose of the resource room, both as it appears in the literature and as teachers said during our interviews, is to offer remediation to students so that they can succeed in the general education classroom. Previous data the principal investigators collected on resource room students in New York City public schools consistently indicated that, for many students, resource room does not improve the tested achievement scores of students with disabilities. The current data suggest, however, that when resource room service is diluted, such as when eight students rather than five are seen concurrently, test achievement scores decline, at times substantially. Evidently, when five students are in resource room they can hold their own and not fall farther behind academically. With eight students in a group, many students lose ground.

Evaluation Objective 7. To what extent did decisions to increase instructional group sizes in resource rooms or related services instructional groups result in students placed in more restrictive placements?

The Board of Education collects data on resource room children who move to more and less restrictive placements. We obtained data for the 1994-95 and the 1995-96 school years. These two academic years corresponded to the years immediately

before and following the change in instructional group size. Because we had the data available, we also compared the rates of movement toward more restrictive placements for students attending resource room programs with those that occurred during the 1991-92 and 1992-93 school years. Table 5 in the appendix indicates that, overall, the increase in instructional group size for resource room students did not affect the number of students moving to more restrictive placements. In order to read the table, note that the first row in Table 5 indicates that during the 1992-93 school year there were 5,347 reevaluations, either requested reevaluations or scheduled triennial evaluations, of resource room students. Of these 1,152 (21.54%) resulted in a more restrictive placement (MRE).

The results presented in Table 5 do not suggest that increases in instructional group size were accompanied by increases in children referred for placement in more restrictive environments.

Evaluation Objective 8. What was the fiscal impact of these changes on the NYC Board of Education? Were the cost savings realized?

It is important to realize that the Board of Education had two concurrent goals in implementing mandate relief. One goal was to effect cost savings. The other was to reduce waiting lists for students who required special education services. The intent was to produce costs savings from the resource room increases and to reduce waiting lists for children who needed speech service. We will discuss cost savings for resource room programming now. Issues related to the waiting list reductions were presented in our discussion of the second evaluation objective.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

There are two ways to present data with regard to cost reductions. First, did the Board save money? Second, did it meet intended targets for savings?

With respect to costs savings, between 1994-95 and 1995-96, the number of resource room teachers was reduced by 663 positions. Using the Board's estimated cost for a resource room teacher to be approximately $37,200, including fringe benefits, $24,663,000 in teacher salaries were saved by reducing 663 teaching lines in elementary, middle schools and high schools.

A reduction of 663 teachers also generates a reduction in ancillary supports, i.e., supervisors, with 22 classes generating one supervisor, teacher trainers, absences, averaging eight days per teacher, clerical support, and Teacher's Choice. About $1,550,000 in ancillary costs was thus saved. In all, a total of about $26,000,000 was saved by the increases in instructional group size. The achieved savings met the Board's target goals.

Evaluation Objective 9. To what extent did these changes impact on New York City's ability to provide a timely, free and appropriate public education to students with disabilities?

In our discussion of Evaluation Objective 2, we noted the substantial decrease in waiting lists for students with disabilities requiring speech services. We do not have any other data with respect to the timeliness of placement for children with disabilities.

Evaluation Objective 10. To what extent did mediation and/or impartial hearings result from these changes?

The Board did not computerize any data pursuant to impartial hearings or mediations. The department responsible for overseeing impartial hearing became computerized this past Fall. Whatever data were collected was sent to the State Education Department (S.E.D.) on raw data sheets.

Data summaries concerning hearings that we received from S.E.D. showed that there was an increase from 1,067 to 1,444 in impartial hearings in New York City between the 1994-95 and 1995-96 school years, an increase of 377. Of the 1,444 impartials, 71, or about 5%, involved resource room students.

We do not know the percentage of the 71 hearings that resulted from parents' dissatisfaction with the increase in instructional group size. The director of the impartial hearing office for the Board of Education recalls that there was a "surge" in requests for an impartial hearing that related to mandate, but she could not be any more specific in her recollections. However, considering that mandate relief impacted about 40,000 students attending resource rooms, we would conclude from the available data that there was not a precipitous increase in impartial hearings that resulted from the change in instructional group size. Even if every single impartial involving resource rooms were the direct result of mandate relief, which is highly unlikely, less than 20% of the increase from 1994-95 to 1995-96 would be attributed to mandate relief.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND LIMITATIONS

Our evaluation of mandate relief indicated the following:

1. About $26 million dollars was saved from the resource room program, an amount that represented the projected savings.

2. Waiting lists for students with disabilities requiring speech service were reduced substantially, although many students remain on the waiting list. We were unable to determine, however, the effectiveness of interventions for speech service regardless of group size. Also, we were unable to obtain data for children who required speech improvement service but were not enrolled in special education.

3. There was a substantial decrease in the reading achievement scores of resource room students, especially at the sixth grade. Math scores for the sample of school selected did not decline significantly.

4. Increasing instructional group size did not result in a corresponding increase in the number of children placed in more restrictive settings.

5. The substantial majority of parents found that resource room helped their children. Overall, parents were not well informed of resource room practices, especially the instructional group size of their child's resource room.

6. Resource room teachers felt that increases in instructional group size diminished their ability to help students.

7. About one-fourth of the allotted instructional time involved escorting students to and from their classrooms, thereby decreasing instructional time.

8. Direct observations of resource room instruction revealed very little time

being spent in individual instruction. Most instruction was offered to the group as a whole. Students tended to be on-task during resource room instruction.

9. As students progress from primary school to middle school to high school, their attendance in resource room declines at a greater rate than the decline in attendance for the overall general education population. Stated somewhat differently, as students become older they are less likely to attend resource room when they are at school.

The data we have presented must be interpreted with regard to their limitations. First, because of the reticence of many building administrators to participate in the study, the findings may be skewed. In general, we were able to conduct our interviews in about half the schools we identified. We doubt that the responses of school administrators who were willing and able to submit to our interview generalize to those school administrators who couldn't find time to meet with us or who were too fearful to meet with us. The parent data, teacher interview responses, and observations may represent a best case scenario.

Second, we could have presented more precise analyses of the effects on achievement if we had individual student achievement data over a multi-year period. We did not have such data; instead, we had school level aggregates of achievement. On the other hand, we are aware from previous experience that there is severe attrition in the numbers of students for whom three or more years of consecutive achievement data are available.

Third, we indicated the major benefit of mandate relief with respect to speech

service was the reduction in waiting lists. We were not able to obtain any "hard" data on the efficacy of speech services that might have allowed us to determine whether there was a decline in effectiveness because of the increase. On the other hand, resource room teachers stated that increases made their job more difficult and less effective, an opinion validated by other data we presented. We have little reason to doubt that speech is also delivered less effectively under larger instructional conditions.

Fourth, we were unable to obtain data on waiting lists, if they existed, for resource room placements. Interviews of principals, site supervisors, and resource room teachers consistently indicated that the per session resource room caseload was reduced as a result of mandate relief. We would prefer to have more specific and reliable data to support those statements, however.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on these findings, we advance one recommendation:

Because the findings indicated that the increase in resource room group size adversely impacted students' academic performance in terms of test scores and amount of instruction received, we recommend that no more than five students be instructed at any one time in the resource room.

Because the data we collected for speech service were not as conclusive as they were for resource room programming, we do not offer any recommendations with regard to speech.

APPENDICES

Listing of Statistical Tables 1 - 5 p. 38 - 45

Questionnaires & Chronology of Correspondence Appendices A - K

TABLE 1

Students Receiving (awaiting) Speech Services

Provider	Language	1994-95		1995-96	
		receive	(await)	receive	(await)
Board of Educ.	English	21,519	(7,612)	27,181	(7,220)
Board of Educ.	Bilingual	1,394	(1,644)	1,992	(1,726)
Agency	English	276	(3,158)	147	(1,349)
Agency	Bilingual	14	(0)	0	(1)
Independent	English	105	(371)	143	(155)
Independent	Bilingual	36	(2,339)	571	(1,746)

TABLE 2

Percent of Students Reading at or Above State Reference Point[1,2]

Third Grade

	1993-94	1994-95	1995-96
General education	64.57 (16.23)	64.26 (16.87)	59.90 (14.69)
Number of Schools providing data	27	27	27
Resource Room	27.68 (29.39)	19.47 (23.17)	14.20 (21.40)
Number of schools providing data	24	24	24

Sixth Grade

	1993-94	1994-95	1995-96
General education	66.34 (16.11)	71.78 (15.77)	70.83 (16.23)
Number of schools	18	18	18
Resource Room	29.24 (18.63)	29.02 (20.16)	15.82 (13.96)
Number of schools	13	13	13

Eighth Grade

	1993-94	1994-95	1995-96
General education	83.53 (11.18)	82.62 (12.28)	82.07 (12.83)
Number of schools	9	9	9
Resource Room	63.09 (20.90)	56.44 (21.97)	47.16 (14.62)
Number of schools	8	8	8

1 Data reported are for same schools over three-year period

2 Resource room students are enrolled in same schools as general education students. Data for resource rooms absent for some schools either because no resource room children attended or because data were missing. For example, at third grade level resource room students' scores are represented in 24 of the 27 schools for which general education students' scores are available.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 3

PERCENT OF STUDENTS ON OR ABOVE GRADE LEVEL FOR MATH

(n = 32 schools for general education and resource room)

	1994	1995	1996
General educ.	81.97 (12.38)	85.35 (11.44)	87.31 (8.97)
Resource room	54.51 (28.16)	59.52 (26.38)	55.79 (25.36)

TABLE 4

Repeated Measures ANOVA for Grade 3 Math Data.
(% of Students at SRP is Dependent Measure)

LEVELS ENCOUNTERED DURING PROCESSING ARE:
TYPE$
GEN ED RES ROOM

20 CASES DELETED DUE TO MISSING DATA.

NUMBER OF CASES PROCESSED: 50

LEAST SQUARES MEANS.

TYPE$ =GEN EDUC N OF SCHOOLS = 27.000

	1994	1995	1996
MEAN	85.644	88.748	88.467
St.Error	4.137	4.084	3.777

TYPE$ =RES ROOM N OF SCHOOLS = 23.000

	1994	1995	1996
MEAN	58.674	63.513	59.480
St. Error	4.482	4.425	4.093

UNIVARIATE AND MULTIVARIATE REPEATED MEASURES ANALYSIS

****
* BETWEEN SUBJECTS EFFECTS *
****

TEST FOR EFFECT CALLED: TYPE$ (GEN ED. v. RES ROOM)

TEST OF HYPOTHESIS

SOURCE	SS	DF	MS	F	P
HYPOTHESIS	27291.374	1	27291.374	42.110	0.000
ERROR	31108.364	48	648.091		

****
* WITHIN SUBJECTS EFFECTS *
****

+ TRIALS FACTOR: a (YEAR -1994:1995:1996)

TEST FOR EFFECT CALLED: CONSTANT

SINGLE DEGREE-OF-FREEDOM POLYNOMIAL CONTRASTS

DEGREE	SS	DF	MS	F	P
1	81.772	1	81.772	0.278	0.601
ERROR	14129.049	48	294.355		
2	310.981	1	310.981	0.875	0.354
ERROR	17050.535	48	355.219		

UNIVARIATE REPEATED MEASURES F-TEST

SOURCE	SS	DF	MS	F	P
HYPOTHESIS	392.753	2	196.376	0.605	0.548
ERROR	31179.584	96	324.787		

MULTIVARIATE TEST STATISTICS

WILKS' LAMBDA =	0.976				
F-STATISTIC =	0.566	DF =	2. 47	PROB =	0.571
PILLAI TRACE =	0.024				
F-STATISTIC =	0.566	DF =	2. 47	PROB =	0.571
HOTELLING-LAWLEY TRACE =	0.024				
F-STATISTIC =	0.566	DF =	2. 47	PROB =	0.571

TEST FOR EFFECT CALLED: TYPE$ (Group X Year Interaction)

SINGLE DEGREE-OF-FREEDOM POLYNOMIAL CONTRASTS

DEGREE	SS	DF	MS	F	P
1	25.232	1	25.232	0.086	0.771
ERROR	14129.049	48	294.355		
2	62.312	1	62.312	0.175	0.677
ERROR	17050.535	48	355.219		

UNIVARIATE REPEATED MEASURES F-TEST

SOURCE	SS	DF	MS	F	P
HYPOTHESIS	87.543	2	43.772	0.135	0.874
ERROR	31179.584	96	324.787		

MULTIVARIATE TEST STATISTICS

WILKS' LAMBDA =	0.995				
F-STATISTIC =	0.127	DF =	2. 47	PROB =	0.881
PILLAI TRACE =	0.005				
F-STATISTIC =	0.127	DF =	2. 47	PROB =	0.881
HOTELLING-LAWLEY TRACE =	0.005				
F-STATISTIC =	0.127	DF =	2. 47	PROB =	0.881

Repeated Measures ANOVA for Grade 6 Math Data.
(% of Students at SRP is Dependent Measure)

LEVELS ENCOUNTERED DURING PROCESSING ARE:
TYPE$
GEN ED RES ROOM

NUMBER OF CASES PROCESSED: 27

LEAST SQUARES MEANS.
TYPE$ =GEN ED N OF SCHOOLS = 16.000

	1994	1995	1996
MEAN	79.319	82.450	86.338
St. Error	4.285	5.767	5.302

TYPE$ =RES ROOM N OF SCHOOLS = 11.000

	1994	1995	1996
MEAN	57.082	57.164	53.536
St. Error	5.167	6.955	6.395

UNIVARIATE AND MULTIVARIATE REPEATED MEASURES ANALYSIS

****
* BETWEEN SUBJECTS EFFECTS *
****

TEST FOR EFFECT CALLED: TYPE$ (GEN v. RES ROOM)

TEST OF HYPOTHESIS

SOURCE	SS	DF	MS	F	P
HYPOTHESIS	14019.192	1	14019.192	17.484	0.000
ERROR	20045.395	25	801.816		

****
* WITHIN SUBJECTS EFFECTS *
****

+ TRIALS FACTOR: a (Year -1994:1995:1996)

TEST FOR EFFECT CALLED: CONSTANT

SINGLE DEGREE-OF-FREEDOM POLYNOMIAL CONTRASTS

DEGREE	SS	DF	MS	F	P
1	39.319	1	39.319	0.176	0.678
ERROR	5580.116	25	223.205		
2	9.473	1	9.473	0.038	0.847
ERROR	6264.878	25	250.595		

UNIVARIATE REPEATED MEASURES F-TEST

SOURCE	SS	DF	MS	F	P

HYPOTHESIS	48.792	2	24.396	0.103	0.902
ERROR	11844.994	50	236.900		

MULTIVARIATE TEST STATISTICS

WILKS' LAMBDA =	0.993				
F-STATISTIC =	0.088	DF =	2. 24	PROB =	0.916
PILLAI TRACE =	0.007				
F-STATISTIC =	0.088	DF =	2. 24	PROB =	0.916
HOTELLING-LAWLEY TRACE =	0.007				
F-STATISTIC =	0.088	DF =	2. 24	PROB =	0.916

TEST FOR EFFECT CALLED: TYPE$ (Group X Year Interaction)

SINGLE DEGREE-OF-FREEDOM POLYNOMIAL CONTRASTS

DEGREE	SS	DF	MS	F	P
1	363.741	1	363.741	1.630	0.213
ERROR	5580.116	25	223.205		
2	21.662	1	21.662	0.086	0.771
ERROR	6264.878	25	250.595		

UNIVARIATE REPEATED MEASURES F-TEST

SOURCE	SS	DF	MS	F	P
HYPOTHESIS	385.404	2	192.702	0.813	0.449
ERROR	11844.994	50	236.900		

MULTIVARIATE TEST STATISTICS

WILKS' LAMBDA =	0.923				
F-STATISTIC =	0.995	DF =	2. 24	PROB =	0.384
PILLAI TRACE =	0.077				
F-STATISTIC =	0.995	DF =	2. 24	PROB =	0.384
HOTELLING-LAWLEY TRACE =	0.083				
F-STATISTIC =	0.995	DF =	2. 24	PROB =	0.384

TABLE 5

PERCENTAGE OF RE-EVALUATIONS RESULTING IN MORE RESTRICTIVE ENVIRONMENTS (MRE)

Year	Elementary school	Middle school
91-92	1152 of 5347 (21.54%) were placed in more restrictive environments (MRE)	
92-93	714 of 4082 (17.49%) were placed in MRE	369 of 3314 (11.1%) were placed in MRE
94-95	725 of 3888 (18.6%) were placed in MRE	360 of 3428 (10.5%) were placed in MRE
95-96	715 of 3686 (19.4%) were placed in MRE	344 of 3245 (10.6%) were placed in MRE

Appendix A

THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT/THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK/ALBANY, N.Y. 12234

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER FOR VOCATIONAL AND EDUCATIONAL SERVICES FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES

July 29, 1996

Ms. Judy Rizzo
Deputy Chancellor for Instruction
NYC Board of Education
110 Livingston Street
Room 1028
Brooklyn, NY 11201

Dear Ms. Rizzo:

The State Education Department has awarded a discretionary grant to New York University (NYU) to conduct an independent study of the impact of modifying instructional group sizes in resource rooms and related services groups in New York City. NYU will conduct this study between July 1, 1996 and January 31, 1997.

NYU is looking forward to working cooperatively with the Board of Education as they implement this study. They have been in contact with board representatives to serve on their technical advisory committee. Any support you can provide to facilitate their entree to schools and access to appropriate data would be most appreciated.

Thank you for your support of this important study. If you have any questions, please contact Thomas B. Neveldine at (518) 473-2878 or Dr. Jay Gottlieb of NYU at (212) 998-5097.

Sincerely,

Lawrence C. Gloeckler

cc: Thomas B. Neveldine
Rebecca Cort
Dr. Jay Gottlieb
Patricia Geary

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

New York University
A private university in the public service

School of Education
Department of Teaching and Learning

East Building, Room 200
239 Greene Street
New York, NY 10003-6674
Telephone: (212) 998-5460, 5200
Fax: (212) 995-4049

August 23, 1996

Dr. Judith Rizzo
Deputy Chancellor for Instruction
New York City Public Schools
110 Livingston Street-10th floor
Brooklyn, NY 11201

Dear Dr. Rizzo:

You recently received a letter from Deputy Commissioner Lawrence Gloeckler of the New York State Education Department informing you that New York University was awarded a contract to study the impact of mandate relief on resource room and speech services in the New York City Schools. Mark Alter and I co-direct this evaluation effort, and we are writing to ask your cooperation and assistance in soliciting the cooperation of administrators of 45 schools that we have selected for data collection.

We would appreciate it if you would inform district superintendents involved that we will be contacting one or two building principals in each district to schedule interviews with the principal, resource room teacher(s), speech service providers, and a small sample of classroom teachers. As part of our activities we will also conduct observations of instructional programming in a subset of 25 resource rooms. We anticipate that we will conduct about four observations in each selected resource room.

Enclosed you will find a listing of the 45 schools we identified for inclusion in the study. We would appreciate it if the superintendents would ask their building administrators to cooperate in our efforts. The timeline for completion of the final report is January 31, 1997, and we have to complete all data collection by the end of November to submit a final report to the New York State Education Department by that date.

Also, as part of the requirement of the State's RFP, we assembled a technical advisory group to assist us in our effort. We asked Mr. Bob Tobias and Ms. Nilda Soto-Ruiz to serve as members of the technical advisory group, and we hope this meets with your approval.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

We would like to thank you in advance for your cooperation and assistance.

Sincerely yours,

Jay Gottlieb and Mark Alter
Professors

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
RUDOLPH F. CREW, Ed. D., Chancellor

OFFICE OF THE CHANCELLOR
110 Livingston Street - Brooklyn, NY 11201

October 3, 1996

The State Education Department has awarded New York University a contract to conduct a study on the impact of mandate relief on resource room and speech services in the New York City schools. NYU's data collection efforts will be based on a sample of 45 schools situated throughout the city. They have selected High School to be included in the study. Given the critical importance of this research, we would appreciate your encouraging the principal and staff to participate.

In each school, NYU field researchers will undertake brief interviews with an administrator and several faculty members (resource room teachers, speech service providers and classroom teachers who have resources room students in their classrooms). They will also observe resource room instruction on four occasions for one-period each at mutually acceptable times.

The principal will be asked to distribute questionnaires to parents of these children, which will include a letter on how their children will be involved, and indicating that all parents have the choice to participate or not. Parents will be informed that if they decline, their child will in no way be adversely affected. While we believe teachers will be interested in participating in the study, they may also opt not to participate. Subjects will remain anonymous and only aggregated data will be reported.

The researchers will contact the school principals directly to discuss the study in more detail and to schedule their visits. Again, we would appreciate your encouraging the principals to allow their school to be included in the study.

Thank you for your continued cooperation.

Sincerely,

Judith A. Rizzo, Ed.D.
Deputy Chancellor for Instruction

JAR:rm

c: Robert Tobias
Jay Gottlieb (NYU)
Carmen Alvarez (UFT)

New York University
A private university in the public service

School of Education
Department of Teaching and Learning

East Building, Room 200
239 Greene Street
New York, NY 10003-6674
Telephone: (212) 998-5460, 5200
Fax: (212) 995-4049

September, 1996

Dear Principal,

New York University has received a contract from the State Education Department to examine the effects of mandate relief on children in Resource Rooms and Speech programs. The Board of Education has been informed of this study and has been working closely with us. Your school has been randomly selected to participate in this study. You should have already been informed of this project by your community superintendent.

As part of our activities, we will be interviewing you, your resource room teacher(s), your speech teacher(s), and possibly some general education teachers who have had resource room students in their classes. The interviews with you and the general education teachers should take no longer than 15 minutes. Interviews with resource room teachers and speech providers should take one class period. We will also be visiting, on about four occasions, a sample of resource rooms. During our visits, we will be observing instruction as it occurs.

We will be in contact with you on September 20 to schedule a visit the week of September 23, 1996. When we meet with you, we will give you a package of envelopes, each containing a permission slip for parents to complete as well as a brief parent questionnaire. We will be asking you to distribute these envelopes to resource room teachers so that they, in turn, might give it to each child on their register to be taken home for parents' review.

In preparation for our visit to your school, we would appreciate if you would have the following data available:

- the number of children who receive resource room support and speech services in your school
- their schedules and attendance records
- their linguistic status (monolingual/bilingual)
- the number of children receiving services on a per session basis
- the number of full-time and/or part-time resource room or speech teachers working in your school
- their names and how we can contact them

In order to evaluate the impact of mandate relief, we will require the above data for the current school year, the 1995-6 school year, and the 1994-5 school year. The availability of this data during our initial visit to your school will greatly facilitate the successful completion of our project.

Please be advised that all responses will be kept strictly confidential and no personal or school identifiers will be used in the report in any form whatsoever.

Thank you in advance for your assistance and co-operation.

Sincerely yours,

Jay Gottlieb, Ph.D., Mark Alter, Ph.D.

Principal's Interview for Mandate Relief

1. Do you know what mandate relief is?

2. Who notified the parents about the pending change?

3. What changes in instructional group size occurred in this school as a result of mandate relief?

4. Who notified the parents about the pending change?

5. What role did you have in formulating changes in instructional size?

6. Have you noticed any change in the effectiveness of the resource room services as a consequence of mandate relief?

7. Do you have any hard evidence of change in effectiveness, test scores, classroom teacher reports, fewer disciplinary notices?

8. Have you received any complaints from parents over the change in instructional group size in either resource room or speech service?

9. What primary purpose does resource room serve in your school?

10. Has the number of non-special education children attending resource rooms (ERSE children) changed as a function of mandate relief?

11. Has the number of children receiving per session services decreased as a result of mandate relief? From what number to what number?

12. Who had primary responsibility for the decision?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

School _____ Grade range _____
in your **Resource Room**

1. Did you know about the change in Resource Room size for the purpose of mandate relief?

_____ Yes _____ No

2. How did you learn about the change?

_____

3. Were you told that you had to change?

_____ Yes _____ No

By whom? _____

4. Who (if anyone) informed the parents?

_____

5. What role (if any) did the School-Based Support Team play?

_____

6. Did you know that this change was allowed by the State as a variance for New York City but that it was not a State mandate?

_____ Yes _____ No

7. How many students were on your Resource Room register as of:

May 1, 1996 _____

May 1, 1995 _____

May 1, 1994 _____

8.Please estimate the average number of children in attendance per class period during each of the past three years?

1996-97 _____

1995-96 _____

1994-95 _____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

9. How many students do you currently have on register per period (1996-7)?

Period 1 _____
Period 2 _____
Period 3 _____
Period 4 _____
Period 5 _____
Period 6 _____
Period 7 _____
Period 8 _____

10. How many Resource Rooms (bilingual or monolingual) were there in your school during the last 3 years?

		With a full-time teacher assigned?	
(1996-97)	_____	____ Yes	____ No
(1995-96)	_____	____ Yes	____ No
(1994-95)	_____	____ Yes	____ No

11. Where is the Resource Room located in the school?

_____

12. Is there ever more than one class running concurrently in the same Resource Room?

_____ Yes _____ No

13. Do you know how many children receive Resource Room support on a per session basis this year? last year?

(1996-97) _____ Students _____ Don't know

(1995-96) _____ Students _____ Don't know

14. Why do you think children are getting Resource Room support on a per session basis last year?

_____

15. How many years have you been teaching? _____

in this building? _____

as a Resource Room teacher? _____

16. Do you teach students who are supposed to get bilingual services?

_____ Yes _____ No

Are you bilingually licensed? _____ Yes _____ No

17. Is there a scheduled time in your program for collaboration or consultation with general education teachers (with respect to paperwork, planning for instruction, and/or reviewing student performance)?

_____ Yes _____ No

If there is, when and for how long? _____

_____

Does the number of students you serve affect that scheduled time?

_____ Yes _____ No

18. Is your lesson plan consistent with the general education curriculum?

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Don't Know

19. How many resource room students did you recommend for decertification last year?

_____ students

How many were decertified?

_____ students

20. Of your assigned students, how many are/were scheduled to attend resource room more than one period daily?

_____ students

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

21. In your opinion, what is the primary purpose of a Resource Room?

_____

_____

_____

_____

22. How effectively are you able to accommodate the purpose of the Resource Room you just indicated, and why?

_____

_____

_____

_____

23. Based upon this year's enrollment, what percentage of time during the class period (45 min.) was typically spent instructing:

large groups (5 or more) _____ %

small groups (2-4) _____

individuals _____

24. What percentage of time during the class period (45 min.) do you spend teaching the following subjects?

Teaching reading _____ %

Teaching writing _____

Teaching math _____

Teaching science _____

Teaching social studies _____

25. Can you indicate three specific instructional strategies you use in reading and writing?

_____

_____

_____

_____

26. What are your non-teaching responsibilities?

_____

_____

_____

Have they changed with the increased enrollment?

_____ Yes _____ No _____ N/A

27. Do you maintain records and/or samples of your students' work?

_____ Yes _____ No

If Yes, can I see them? _____ Yes _____ No

28. On a scale of 1-5, indicate extent of difficulty in accomplishing each action below (1= not difficult, 5= very difficult):

ACTION	Based on an Enrollment of 5					Based on an Enrollment of 8				
Managing Student Behavior	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Individualizing Instruction	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Modifying Instructional Materials	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Maintaining Contact with General Education Teacher(s)	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Monitoring Student Progress	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Sharing Information With Parents	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Helping with Homework Assignments from Regular Education Classrooms	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Supporting Regular Education Class Content	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Conferring with other Resource Room and /or Special Education Teachers	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

29. Using the nine categories below, based on last year's enrollment, how do you think your time as a Resource Room teacher should be used?

Remediation	_____	% of an average school day
Tutorial (class work)	_____	% of an average school day
Tutorial (homework)	_____	% of an average school day
Consultation with classroom teacher(s)	_____	% of an average school day
Managing behavior	_____	% of an average school day
Escorting students to and from class	_____	% of an average school day
Consultation with related service providers	_____	% of an average school week
Consultation with School Based Support Team	_____	% of an average school month
Diagnostic and/or mastery testing	_____	% of an average school year

30. Based on an enrollment of 8 students, how have you allocated your time?

Remediation	_____	% of an average school day
Tutorial (class work)	_____	% of an average school day
Tutorial (homework)	_____	% of an average school day
Consultation with classroom teacher(s)	_____	% of an average school day
Managing behavior	_____	% of an average school day
Escorting students to and from class	_____	% of an average school day

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Consultation with related service providers _____% of an average school week

Consultation with School Based Support Team _____% of an average school month

Diagnostic and/or mastery testing _____% of an average school year

31. If you experienced an increase in caseload which of the above nine activities were most affected, and how?

_____

_____

_____

_____

32. Is there any other information you would like to share?

_____

_____

_____

_____

School _____ Grade range _____
in your speech groups

1. Did you know about the change in instructional/therapeutic group size for school related service providers as a result of the State-allowed variance for New York City?

_____ Yes _____ No

2. Specifically how has the change affected you?

_____

3. Were you told that you must change group sizes?

_____ Yes _____ No

By whom? _____

4. Who (if anyone) informed the parents?

_____

5. What role (if any) did the School-Based Support Team play?

_____

6. Has the increase in Resource Room instructional group size affected your own work in any way?

_____ Yes _____ No

If yes, how? _____

7. Are you a licensed bilingual speech therapist?

_____ Yes _____ No

8. If no, do you have students on your caseload who are supposed to get bilingual services?

_____ Yes _____ No

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

9. As a result of changes in caseload of Resource Room teachers, are you now seeing students who are supposed to get bilingual services?

_____ Yes _____ No

10. Are you a Board of Education Employee or a Contracted Service Provider?

_____ Board of Education Employee _____ Contracted Service Provider

11. How many students were on your caseload to provide speech services on:

May 1, 1996 _____

May 1, 1995 _____

May 1, 1994 _____

12. How many periods a day did you see students in each of the past three years?

1996-97 _____

1995-96 _____

1994-95 _____

13. What was the average number of students you saw each day in each of the past three years?

1996-97 _____

1995-96 _____

1994-95 _____

14. How many students did you see individually in each of the past three years?

1996-97 _____

1995-96 _____

1994-95 _____

15. For those students you were able to see individually what was the average amount of the time you spent per session?

	1996-97	95-96	94-95
15 minutes	_____	_____	_____
20 minutes	_____	_____	_____
30 minutes	_____	_____	_____
45 minutes	_____	_____	_____

16. On average; how long were the sessions that you saw groups of students in each of the past three years?

	1996-97	95-96	94-95
15 minutes	_____	_____	_____
20 minutes	_____	_____	_____
30 minutes	_____	_____	_____
45 minutes	_____	_____	_____

17. On average, many students did you see in groups in each of the past three years?

1996-97 _____

1995-96 _____

1994-95 _____

18. How many students on your caseload were also seen by the resource room teacher?

1996-97 _____

1995-96 _____

1994-95 _____

19. As part of your load, do you see children classified as special education students?

Yes _____ No _____

20. If yes, how many students were classified as special education in each of the past three years?

1996-97 _____

1995-96 _____

1994-95 _____

21. What are the primary reason why students were referred for speech?

Speech Problem: 1_____

2_____

3_____

Language Problem: 1_____

2_____

3_____

Other? 1_____

22. Have these reasons changed over the last couple of years?

_____ Yes _____ No

23. If Yes, why?_____

_____

_____

24. How many years have you been with your current assignment?

_____ Years

25. How many years have you been teaching? _____

in this building? _____

as a speech teacher? _____

26. How many school buildings do you currently service?

_____ Buildings

27. Do you meet with general education teachers: (Circle one)

During regularly scheduled meetings	Often	A lot	Sometimes	Never
Randomly scheduled meetings	Often	A lot	Sometimes	Never
Informal meetings (in passing)	Often	A lot	Sometimes	Never
No time to meet.	Often	A lot	Sometimes	Never

28. Do you meet with special education teachers? (Circle one)

During regularly scheduled meetings	Often	A lot	Sometimes	Never
Randomly scheduled meetings	Often	A lot	Sometimes	Never
Informal meetings (in passing)	Often	A lot	Sometimes	Never
No time to meet.	Often	A lot	Sometimes	Never

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

29. Do you meet with parents? (Circle one)

During regularly scheduled meetings	Often	A lot	Sometimes	Never
Randomly scheduled meetings	Often	A lot	Sometimes	Never
Informal meetings (in passing)	Often	A lot	Sometimes	Never
No time to meet	Often	A lot	Sometimes	Never

30. On a scale of 1 to 5, rank in order of importance what your primary roles as a speech provider are?

Assessment _____

Speech Intervention _____

Language Intervention _____

Meeting with parents _____

Meeting with teachers _____

31. On a scale of 1 to 5, rank in order of importance what your primary roles as a speech provider should be?

Assessment _____

Speech Intervention _____

Language Intervention _____

Meeting with parents _____

Meeting with teachers _____

32. What are the most important factors that affect your delivery of speech related services?

_____

_____

33. Why do you think children are getting Speech related services support on a <u>per session</u> basis this year?

_____

_____

34. Last year (1995-6) how many speech students did you drop from your caseload because they no longer needed your services?

_____ students

35. Last year (1995-6), how many students receiving speech and resource room help were decertified?

_____ students

36. Of your caseload, how many students were scheduled to attend speech:

	1995-6	1994-5
once per week?	_____	_____
twice per week?	_____	_____
three times per week?	_____	_____
four times per week?	_____	_____
daily?	_____	_____
more than once daily?	_____	_____

37. Based upon last year's enrollment, what percentage of your time is typically spent instructing:

full groups	(8 students)	_____ %
large groups	(5 to 7)	_____ %
small groups	(2 to 4)	_____ %
individually	(only one)	_____ %

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

38. What are your responsibilities not directly related to providing speech services?

_____

_____

_____

_____

39. Have these responsibilities changed with the increased enrollment?

_____ Yes _____ No _____ N/A

40. Do you maintain records and/or samples of your students' work?

_____ Yes _____ No

41. If yes, can I see them?

_____ Yes _____ No

42. On a scale of 1-5, indicate extent of difficulty in accomplishing each action below (1= not difficult, 5= very difficult):

ACTION						
Managing Student Behavior	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Individualizing Instruction	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Modifying Instructional Materials	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Maintaining Contact with General Education Teacher(s)	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Monitoring Student Progress	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Sharing Information With Parents	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Helping with Homework Assignments from Regular Education Classrooms	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Supporting Regular Education Class Content	1	2	3	4	5	N/A
Conferring with other Resource Room and /or Special Education Teachers	1	2	3	4	5	N/A

43. Using the nine categories below, based on your current caseload, how do you think your time as a speech teacher should be used? (figures should add up to 100?)

Classroom Observations _____ % of school month

Informal Assessments _____ %

Consultation with classroom teacher(s) _____ %

Consultation with parent(s) _____ %

Consultation with School Based Support Team _____ %

Consultation with related service providers _____ %

Managing behavior _____ %

Escorting students to and from class _____ %

Relating Speech services to classroom instruction _____ %

44. If you experienced an increase in caseload, which of the above nine activities were most affected, and how?

_____

_____

_____

45. Is there any other information you would like to share?

_____

_____

Appendix H

School Code _____
Interviewer Code _____

Interview of Classroom Teacher

Classroom Teacher _____ Grade _____
School _____ District_____
Subject _____

1. How many students are on your register? _____

2. How many students receive resource room support?_____

3. How often do you meet with the resource room teacher to plan students' educational programs?

_____
_____
_____

4. When and where do these meetings occur?

_____
_____
_____

5. Has there been any change in the amount of meeting time with the resource room teacher in the past couple years? If yes, how has it changed?

_____

6. How has resource room programming helped the students in your class?

_____
_____
_____

7. Are you aware of a change in policy regarding the allowable instructional group size in a resource room?_____

8. Do you find any noticeable change in the way the resource room has affected you or your students since the number of children attending resource room has changed?

_____
_____

9. Do you have any contact with the School-Based Support Team (SBST) and why?

_____
_____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

New York University
A private university in the public service

School of Education
Department of Teaching and Learning

East Building, Room 200
239 Greene Street
New York, NY 10003-6674
Telephone: (212) 998-5460, 5200
Fax: (212) 995-4049

October, 1996

Dear Parent,

Your school has been selected to participate in a program to learn more about how resource rooms help children. We would appreciate it if you would take the time to complete the brief questionnaire enclosed. In order to answer some of these questions, you may have to speak with your child about his or her experiences in the resource room.

This project is being conducted by the School of Education at New York University. Please note that your answers to the questionnaire will be strictly confidential for review only by New York University professionals. Your responses will not be shared with your child, your child's teacher or any school administrator. Your responses will be used as part of a report on resource rooms that will be given to the New York City School's Chancellor and the New York State Education Department. Your name or your child's name will not appear anywhere in the document.

As part of our project, we will be visiting resource rooms in your school. We want to see how the resource room serves children. We may or may not be visiting in the resource room when your child is there, depending on your child's schedule. Also, if we do visit when your child is attending the resource room, we will not be identifying any individual children to observe.

Although we would very much like you to complete the form, and return it in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope, please know that you are under no obligation whatsoever to do so. Your decision to answer or not answer will in no way effect your child's education.

If you do not want to complete this form, or you do not want your child involved in any part of the project, please sign at the bottom of the unanswered form and return it in the self-addressed stamped envelope enclosed during the next week.

If you have any questions or would like additional information, please call Roxanne Abder at (212)998-5557 at New York University.

Sincerely,

Jay Gottlieb / Mark Alter

Jay Gottlieb, Ph.D., Mark Alter, Ph.D.

School Code

PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE

If you wish to help us learn more about how resource rooms help children, please fill out this form and return in the enclosed envelope. If you do not want to complete this form, or you do not want your child involved in any part of the project, please sign at the bottom of the unanswered form (on the other side) and return it in the self-addressed stamped envelope enclosed during the next week. Thank you.

1.) **What grade is your child in now?** **GRADE**_____

(Mark the correct response ✓)

2) **Is your child a boy or a girl?** ☐ **Boy** ☐ **Girl**

3) **Does your child speak a language other than English at home?** ☐ **Yes** ☐ **No**

4) **Does your child attend the Resource Room?** ☐ **Yes** ☐ **No**

5) **In what year did your child begin receiving help from the Resource Room?**

☐ **Current School Year** **(1996/97)**

☐ **Last School Year** **(1995/96)**

☐ **Before the 1995/96 School Year**

6) **Does your child receive speech therapy?** ☐ **Yes** ☐ **No**

7) **What year did your child begin receiving help from speech service providers?**

☐ **Current School Year (1996/97)**

☐ **Last School Year (1995/96)**

☐ **Before the 1995/96 School Year**

8) **Does your child receive speech services in an individual or group setting?**

☐ **Individual** ☐ **Group** ☐ **Don't Know**

9) **Have the annual goals for your child changed during the past year?**

☐ **Yes** ☐ **No** ☐ **Don't Know**

10) **When your child was assigned to the Resource Room for the first time, were you told how many children would be in his/her resource room group?**

☐ **Yes** ☐ **No** ☐ **Don't Know**

11) **How many students were in that group?** _____Students ☐ **Don't Know**

12) **Do you know whether the number of children in your child's resource room group has changed since your child first received resource room help?**

☐ **Yes** ☐ **No** ☐ **Don't Know**

13) **If the number of children in the group has changed, has it increased or decreased?**

☐ **Increased** ☐ **Decreased** ☐ **Don't Know**

14) **<u>If the number of children has changed</u>, please answer the following questions:**

Has it affected how often you visit the Resource Room teacher? ☐ **Yes** ☐ **No**

If **YES**, do you visit more or less often now? ☐ More ☐ Less

Has it affected how much homework your child brings home? ☐ **Yes** ☐ **No**

If **YES**, does your child have to do more or less homework? ☐ More ☐ Less

15) **Do you feel the resource room has helped your child be more successful in the regular education classroom?**

☐ **Yes** ☐ **No** ☐ **Don't Know**

16) **If the number of children in the resource room has changed, how do you feel the change has affected your child's progress in the regular education classroom?**

☐ **Slowed progress** ☐ **Improved progress** ☐ **Did not affect progress**

Please explain:

_____

_____

_____

Any comments?

_____

_____

_____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND COOPERATION

Important: If you prefer not to complete the form, or if you do not want your child involved in the project, please check of one or more of the following, sign below and return in the self-addressed stamped envelope:

☐ *I do not want my child involved in this project*

☐ *I do not wish to respond to this questionnaire.*

_____

Signature of Parent or Guardian

New York University
A private university in the public service

School of Education
Department of Teaching and Learning

East Building, Room 200
239 Greene Street
New York, NY 10003-6674
Telephone: (212) 998-5460, 5200
Fax: (212) 995-4049

octubre 1996

Queridos Padres:

Su escuela fue escogida para participar en un programa que nos ayudará a saber cómo la sala de recursos (resource room) ayuda a sus hijos. Sólo necesitamos unos minutos de su tiempo para que conteste las preguntas del cuestionario que incluímos. Sería de mucha ayuda tal vez si usted conversara con su hijo(a) acerca de sus experiencias en la sala de recursos, para así poder contestar algunas de las preguntas.

Este programa es auspiciado por la Escuela de Educación de la Universidad de NuevaYork (New York University). Las respuestas obtenidas en este estudio serán estrictamente confidenciales, y sólo serán revisadas por personas profesionales de la universidad. Sus respuestas tampoco serán compartidas con sus hijos, su maestra(o), ni con ningún miembro de la administración de la escuela. Los resultados de este estudio formarán parte de un informe que se someterá al Canciller de la ciudad de Nueva York y al Departamento de Educación del Estado de Nueva York. El nombre de su hijo(a) tampoco aparecerá en ninguna parte del documento.

Como parte del programa estaremos visitando diferentes salas de recursos en su escuela. Es posible que visitemos la sala de su hijo(a), dependiendo del itinerario. Dado el caso de visitar la sala de su hijo(a), no identificaremos a ningún niño(a) en particular.

Aunque agradeceríamos mucho su participación, Ud. no tiene la obligación de hacerlo. Tiene Ud. la alternativa de participar o no en este programa, y si decide Ud. no hacerlo, esa decisión de ninguna manera afectará la educación de su hijo(a).

Si a usted no le interesa contestar las preguntas o no desea que su hijo(a) participe de ninguna manera en este programa, por favor sólo firme al final de la hoja que contiene las preguntas sin contestar y devuelva la forma en el sobre adjunto. Por favor trate de enviarnos el cuestionario dentro de la próxima semana.

Si tiene alguna pregunta o si precisa alguna otra información, puede comunicarse con Roberto Martínez al (212) 998-5458 en la Universidad de Nueva York.

Cordialmente,

Jay Gottlieb / Mark Alter

Jay Gottlieb, Ph.D., Mark Alter, Ph.D.

E-PDA-E Código de la escuela

CUESTIONARIO PARA LOS PADRES

Si quieres ayudarnos de aprender mas acerca cómo las salas de recursos les ayudan los niños, por favor conteste las siguentes preguntas y devuelva la forma en el sobre adjunto. Si no quieres contestar o si no desea que su hijo(a) participe de ninguna manera en este programa, por favor sólo firme al final de la hoja del cuestionairo (a la vuelta) y enviarnos la forma dentro de la próxima semana. Gracias.

1. ¿En que grado está su hijo(a)? _____Grado

(Marque la respuesta correcta ✓)

2. ¿Tiene Ud. una niña o niño? ☐ Niña ☐ Niño
3. ¿Habla su hijo otro idioma en la casa, aparte de inglés? ☐ Sí ☐ No
4. ¿Se encuentra su hijo(a) en sala de recursos (resource room)? ☐ Sí ☐ No
5. ¿En qué año comenzó su hijo(a) a participar en la sala de recurso (resource room)?
   - ☐ Este año escolar (1996-1997)
   - ☐ El pasado año escolar (1995-1996)
   - ☐ Antes del año escolar 1995-96
6. ¿Está su hijo(a) recibiendo terapia del habla? ☐ Sí ☐ No
7. ¿En que año comenzó su hijo(a) a recibir terapia del habla?
   - ☐ Este año escolar (1996-97)
   - ☐ El pasado año escolar (1995-96)
   - ☐ Antes del año escolar 1995-96
8. ¿Recibe su hijo(a) terapia del habla en grupo o individualmente?
   ☐ Sí ☐ No ☐ No sé
9. ¿Cambiaron durante el año pasado los objetivos anuales de su hijo(a)?
   ☐ Sí ☐ No ☐ No sé
10. Cuando su hijo fue asignado a la sala de recursos (resource room) la primera vez, ¿le informaron a usted cuantos estudiantes habrían en su grupo?
    ☐ Sí ☐ No ☐ No sé
11. ¿Cuantos estudiantes hay en su grupo? _____ estudiantes ☐ No sé

12. ¿Sabe usted si el número de estudiantes en la sala de recursos de su hijo(a) ha variado desde que su hijo(a) comenzó en el programa?

☐ Sí ☐ No ☐ No sé

13. Si el número de estudiantes ha cambiado, ¿este número ha aumentado o disminuído?

☐ Aumentado ☐ Disminuído ☐ No sé

14. Si el número de niños ha cambiado, por favor conteste las siguientes preguntas:

¿Se ha visto afectada la frecuencia con la que visita la sala de recursos?

☐ Sí ☐ No

Si su respuesta es sí, visita usted con más o menos frecuencia?

☐ Más ☐ Menos

¿Se ha afectado la cantidad de asignaciones que el nino trae a casa?

☐ Sí ☐ No

Si la respuesta es sí, ¿tiene su hijo(a) más o menos asignaciones ?

☐ Más ☐ Menos

15. ¿Considera Ud. que su hijo(a) podría tener mas éxito en una sala de educación regular?

☐ Sí ☐ No ☐ No sé

16. Si el número de estudiantes en la sala de recursos ha cambiado, ¿cómo entiende usted que se ha afectado el progreso de su hijo(a) en la sala de educación regular?

☐ Disminuyó el progreso ☐ No afectó el progreso ☐ Mejoró el progreso

Por favor explique:

_____

_____

_____

¿Commentarios?

_____

_____

_____

GRACIAS POR SU AYUDA Y COOPERACION

Importante: Si desean no contestar, o si no desea que su hijo(a) participe de ninguna manera en este programa, por favor marque una y más de las siguentes, firme abajo y devuelva en el sobre adjunto:

☐ *No deseo que mi hijo(a) participe en este estudio.*

☐ *No deseo completar el cuestionario.*

_____

Firma del padre/madre/encargado(a)

Observation Data Sheet **Observer Code**_____

Resource Room ___ **Related Service**_____ **Speech** _____

Teacher Name _____ Date_____

School _____

Number of Students on Register _____

Number of Students in Attendance_____

Observation was conducted during Period ___,

which officially began at _____

and ended at ____.

Actual class lesson began at _____ and ended at _____.

OBSERVER INSTRUCTIONS:

When prompt says <u>observe</u>: ***Find your target student and watch the interaction***

When prompt says <u>record</u>: ***Record what happened at the moment of the "record" prompt. You have 10 seconds to record the requested information.***

Observer Instructions for groups less than 8 students: If there are fewer than 8 students in the classroom, the observation must still take the full allotted time to avoid skewing the data. So, for example, if there are 5 students, observe these 5 and let the tape play out for the observation time for students 6-8. **Begin the new observational period only AFTER the entire 160-sec interval has passed.**

Group Size Codes:

W= whole group instruction
S= small group instruction
I= individual instruction, i.e, student sitting alone doing teacher-directed work
1:1= teacher helping one child specifically

Definitions for observers:

On Task	Child is doing what is expected e.g., reading , writing, in conjunction with the lesson
Off Task Descriptors These could include:	• daydreaming, • reading/drawing/writing not teacher-directed • disrupting others by calling out (unrelated to the lesson) • using verbally abusive language or physical aggression • inappropriate use of environment e.g., spinning in chair, banging on desk
Instructional Downtime 1. Teacher	disorganized gaps in lesson e.g., shuffling papers, leading tangential discussion, insufficient activities for a particular child, students awaiting direction
2. Other Child responding	observed child awaiting other child's response to question posed by teacher
Instructional disruption 1. Other Child initiated	Other child acts out, disrupting the lesson
2. School initiated	PA system interrupts, fire alarms, etc
3. Outside	Outside distractions like subway noises, fire engines, etc, lead to pause in instruction

OBSERVATION PERIOD 1: Please place mark/s (|)describing observed behavior

Group Size (W,S, I, 1:1)	Observed Student	On Task		Off Task Descript-ors	Instructional Downtime		Instructional Disruption		
		Yes	*No*		*Teacher*	*Other Child responding*	*Other Child initiated*	*School initiated*	*Outside*
	Student 1								
	Student 2								
	Student 3								
	Student 4								
	Student 5								
	Student 6								
	Student 7								
	Student 8								

OBSERVATION PERIOD 2: Please place mark/s (|)describing observed behavior

Group Size (W,S, I, 1:1)	Observed Student	On Task		On Task Descript-ors	Instructional Downtime		Instructional Disruption		
		Yes	*No*		*Teacher*	*Other Child responding*	*Other Child initiated*	*School initiated*	*Outside*
	Student 1								
	Student 2								
	Student 3								
	Student 4								
	Student 5								
	Student 6								
	Student 7								
	Student 8								

OBSERVATION PERIOD 3: Please place mark/s (|)describing observed behavior

Group Size (W,S, I, 1:1)	Observed Student	On Task		Off Task Descript-ors	Instructional Downtime		Instructional Disruption		
		Yes	*No*		*Teacher*	*Other Child responding*	*Other Child initiated*	*School initiated*	*Outside*
	Student 1								
	Student 2								
	Student 3								
	Student 4								
	Student 5								
	Student 6								
	Student 7								
	Student 8								

OBSERVATION PERIOD 4: Please place mark/s (|)describing observed behavior

Group Size (W,S, I, 1:1)	Observed Student	On Task		Off Task Descript-ors	Instructional Downtime		Instructional Disruption		
		Yes	*No*		*Teacher*	*Other Child responding*	*Other Child initiated*	*School initiated*	*Outside*
	Student 1								
	Student 2								
	Student 3								
	Student 4								
	Student 5								
	Student 6								
	Student 7								
	Student 8								

Additional Observations.

MATERIALS:

Availability of appropriate materials for the lesson

1	2	3	4	5
no materials available				many materials

Were the materials :

from texts? teacher-made worksheets? commercially available worksheets?

INSTRUCTIONAL GROUPING:

Approximately what percentage of time was spent in whole class instruction? _____%

Approximately what percentage of time was spent in small group instruction? _____%

Approximately what percentage of time was spent in one-on-one instruction? _____%

CLASS MANAGEMENT

Did students appear to be paying attention/listening to the instructional directions?

1	2	3	4	5
None of Observed time				All of Observed time

INSTRUCTIONAL DISRUPTIONS:

Was there instructional disruption from outside the classroom?

1	2	3	4	5
Never				Very Frequently

What was the source of this disruption? _____

PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

How would you rate the physical environment of the classroom?

1	2	3	4	5
Not Satisfactory				Satisfactory

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____